

REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's statement regarding the claim of priority for the subject application. Applicant has deleted paragraph [0001] from the subject specification.

The Office Action objects to claim 7 and 9 as reciting the same limitations. Applicant has cancelled claim 9.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have cancelled claims 11-20 which renders the 112 rejection moot.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 and 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent 6993506 (Jain). Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 4, 9, and 11-20.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-based method for electronic communication between consumer goods trading partners, comprising the steps of providing a software application program which communicates between first and second trading partners over an electronic communication link, inputting user-defined extended data attributes by the first trading partner into a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface, transmitting standard data attributes to the second trading partner, and transmitting the extended data attributes from the plurality of tables as an XML-message to the second trading partner. The tables include (a) a first table for providing extended data definitions of each extended data attribute, each extended data definition in the first table including an extended data definition identification field, extended data name field, extended data type field, extended

data description field, extended entity type field, and unique link to the second trading partner, (b) a second table for correlating each extended data type field used in the first table, the second table including an extended data type field, extended data type name field, and extended data type description field, (c) a third table for correlating each extended entity type used in the first table, the third table including an extended entity type field and extended entity type name field, and (d) a fourth table for correlating the extended data definition identification used in the first table, the fourth table including an entity owner of the extended data type definition and values for each extended data attribute.

The Jain reference does not teach or suggest inputting user-defined extended data attributes by the first trading partner into a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface. Jain does not use a combination of first, second, third, and fourth tables as claimed. More specifically, Jain does not have a first table for providing extended data definitions of each extended data attribute, each extended data definition in the first table including an extended data definition identification field, extended data name field, extended data type field, extended data description field, extended entity type field, and unique link to the second trading partner. Further, Jain does not have a second table for correlating each extended data type field used in the first table, the second table including an extended data type field, extended data type name field, and extended data type description field. Further, Jain does not have a third table for correlating each extended entity type used in the first table, the third table including an extended entity type field

Application Serial No.: 10/053,935
Gregory N. Weismantel
Response to Office Action mailed November 16, 2006

and extended entity type name field. Finally, Jain does not have a fourth table for correlating the extended data definition identification used in the first table, the fourth table including an entity owner of the extended data type definition and values for each extended data attribute. Jain does not use these four tables to define the extended data attributes.

Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the Jain reference. Claims 2, 6, and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Jain in view of US patent 6125391 (Meltzer). Applicant has cancelled claims 11 and 20 which renders the 103 rejection moot.

Applicant has added new claims 21-48.

New claims 21-25 each depend from claim 1 which is believed to be in allowable condition.

New claim 26 recites a computer-implemented method for electronic communication between trading partners comprising the steps of establishing an electronic communication link between first and second trading partners, transmitting standard data attributes associated with a commercial transaction from the first trading partner to the second trading partner, defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface, and transmitting the extended data attributes over the electronic communication link from the first trading partner to the second trading partner. The tables include (a) a first table for providing extended data definitions of each extended data attribute, each extended data definition in the first table

including an extended data definition identification field, extended data name field, extended data type field, extended data description field, extended entity type field, and unique link to the second trading partner, (b) a second table for correlating each extended data type field used in the first table, the second table including an extended data type field, extended data type name field, and extended data type description field, (c) a third table for correlating each extended entity type used in the first table, the third table including an extended entity type field and extended entity type name field, and (d) a fourth table for correlating the extended data definition identification used in the first table, the fourth table including an entity owner of the extended data type definition and values for each extended data attribute.

None of the prior art references of record, including the Jain reference, teach or suggest the step of defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface. None of the references use a combination of first, second, third, and fourth tables as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 26 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record. Claims 27-31 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

New claim 32 recites a computer-implemented method for electronic communication between trading partners comprising the steps of establishing an electronic communication link between first and second trading partners, transmitting standard data attributes associated with a commercial transaction from the first trading partner to the second trading partner, defining

extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface, and transmitting the extended data attributes over the electronic communication link from the first trading partner to the second trading partner. The tables include (a) a first table for providing extended data definitions of each extended data attribute, each extended data definition in the first table including an extended data definition identification field, extended data type field, and extended entity type field, (b) a second table for correlating each extended data type field used in the first table, (c) a third table for correlating each extended entity type used in the first table, and (d) a fourth table for correlating the extended data definition identification used in the first table.

None of the prior art references of record, including the Jain reference, teach or suggest the step of defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface. None of the references use a combination of first, second, third, and fourth tables as claimed.

Accordingly, claim 32 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record. Claims 33-39 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

New claim 40 recites a computer-implemented method for electronic communication between trading partners comprising the step of establishing an electronic communication link between first and second trading partners, transmitting standard data attributes associated with a commercial transaction from the first trading partner to the second trading partner, defining

extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface, and transmitting the extended data attributes over the electronic communication link from the first trading partner to the second trading partner.

None of the prior art references of record, including the Jain reference, teach or suggest the means for defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface.

Accordingly, claim 40 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record. Claims 41-43 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

New claim 44 recites a computer-based system for electronic communication between trading partners comprising means for establishing an electronic communication link between first and second trading partners, means for transmitting standard data attributes associated with a commercial transaction from the first trading partner to the second trading partner, means for defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface, and means for transmitting the extended data attributes over the electronic communication link from the first trading partner to the second trading partner.

None of the prior art references of record, including the Jain reference, teach or suggest the means for defining extended data attributes associated with the commercial transaction in a plurality of tables through a graphical user interface.

Accordingly, claim 44 as amended is believed to patentably distinguish over the prior art references of record. Claims 45-

Application Serial No.: 10/053,935
Gregory N. Weismantel
Response to Office Action mailed November 16, 2006

48 are believed to be in condition for allowance as each is dependent from an allowable base claim.

Applicant(s) believe that all information and requirements for the application have been provided to the USPTO. If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of the Application, Applicant(s) invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due with this Response to U.S. PTO Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,
QUARLES & BRADY LLP

April 13, 2007

By: 

Robert D. Atkins
Reg. No. 34,288

Address all correspondence to:

Robert D. Atkins

Quarles & Brady LLP

One Renaissance Square

Two North Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Telephone: (602) 229-5290

Facsimile: (602) 229-5690

E-mail: rda@quarles.com